



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Office of Trademark Trial and Appeal Administration

Applicant's Name	Inventor's Name	Attorney's Name	Address	City
------------------	-----------------	-----------------	---------	------

Applicant's Name

Inventor's Name

Attorney's Name

Address

Lawrence M. Layin Jr.
Monsanto Company
Patent Department, I-2NA
800 North Lindbergh Blvd.
St. Louis, MO 63167

Serial Number

Serial Number

Classification	Classification
----------------	----------------

DATE MAILED: 11/1/88

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/615,606

Applicant(s)
Abad et al

Examiner
Michael Borin

Art Unit
1631



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claims 1-7 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). | 6) Other: |

Art Unit: 1631

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-7 are currently pending.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claim 1, drawn to polynucleotides, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.
- II. Claim 2, drawn to a purified polypeptide encoded by a polynucleotide of Group I, classified in class 530, subclass 300.
- III. Claims 3-7, drawn to a transformed plant, classified in class 800, subclass 205.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are separate and distinct because the inventions are directed to different chemical types regarding the critical limitations therein. For Group II, the critical feature is a polypeptide whereas for Group I the critical feature is a polynucleotide. It is acknowledged that various processing steps may cause a polypeptide of group II to be directed as to its synthesis by a polynucleotide of Group I, however, the completely separate chemical types of the inventions of Groups I and II supports the undue search burden if both were examined together. Additionally, polypeptides have been most commonly, albeit not always, separately characterized and published in the Biochemical literature, thus significantly adding to the search burden if examiner together, as

Art Unit: 1631

compared to being searched separately. Also, it is pointed out that processing that may connect two groups does not prevent them from being viewed as distinct, because enough processing can result in producing any composition from any other composition if the processing is not so limited to additions, subtractions, enzyme actions, etc. In addition, neither the products in each Group, nor the products of Groups I and II share a common structure which elicits a common activity as to constitute a proper Markush listing. Accordingly, claims 1, 2 are drawn to improper generic and Markush claims.

Inventions I/II and III are separate and distinct, as the claims of Invention I are drawn to polynucleotides and polypeptides, while the claims of group III are drawn to a plant. These are differing biochemical entities having differing biochemical properties, structures and effects. Invention III would require searching in areas unrelated to polynucleotides and polypeptides, and as such, would require an undue burden on the examiner if not restricted.

Sequence Election Requirement Applicable to All Groups

In addition, each Group detailed above reads on a plurality of independent and/or patentably distinct sequences. Each peptide or nucleic acid sequence is independent and/or patentably distinct because they are unrelated compounds, there is no disclosed core structure required for a common utility, and because each of these compounds possess different structure and/or physico-chemical

Art Unit: 1631

properties, and/or capable of separate manufacture and/or use. **For an elected Group the Applicants must further elect a single amino acid or nucleic acid sequence.**

MPEP 803.04 states:

Nucleotide sequences encoding different proteins are structurally distinct chemical compounds and are unrelated to one another. These sequences are thus deemed to normally constitute independent and distinct inventions within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121. Absent evidence to the contrary, each such nucleotide sequence is presumed to represent an independent and distinct invention, subject to a restriction requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 CFR 1.141 et seq.

Examination will be restricted only to a Group drawn to elected sequences.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, and because of their recognized divergent subject matter, and the necessity for non-coextensive literature searches restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any

Art Unit: 1631

amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Borin whose telephone number is (703) 305-4506. Dr. Borin can normally be reached between the hours of 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. EST Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Mr. Michael Woodward, can be reached at (703) 308-4028. The fax telephone number for this group is (703) 305-3014.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

March 19, 2003

MICHAEL BORIN, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER

mlb

